In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al   Examiner: Thomas A. GYORFI
Serial No.: 10/748,178   Group Art Unit: 2435
Filed: December 31, 2003   Attorney Docket: **27153**
Office Action Mailing Date: May 23, 2011   Confirmation No.: 5563

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application in view of the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-35, 38-61, 63, 65, 66, 68 – 80, 107 - 130, and 147 - 149 are in this Application. Claims 36, 37, 62, 64, 67, 81-106 and 131-146 have previously been cancelled.

Claims 1-35, 38-61, 63, 65, 66, 68 – 80, 107 - 130, and 147 - 149 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-35, 38-61, 63, 65, 66, 68 – 80, 107 - 130, and 147 - 149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 1 is rejected as being obvious over Ginter et al. (US Patent No. 5,892,900), hereinafter "Ginter", in view of Gilmour (US Patent No. 6,205,472) and further in view of Peinado, (US Patent No 6,772,340).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Gilmore is cited for teaching use of statistics to identify confidential information, and the use of identifiers.

However Gilmore does not use statistics to identify confidential information based on identifiers. Rather, as discussed at Gilmore column 5 lines 45 to 50 *the users themselves* identify information that raises privacy concerns. Identifiers, as per column 13, are used only for the knowledge base itself, *not* for the information which is excluded from the knowledge base.

The Examiner specifically refers to the second matching step in column 2. However the second matching step in column 2 *assumes* information to be already confidential and merely matches *externally* with this already known information. In other words, although Gilmore *matches* information with confidential information he does not *use statistics* to *identify* the confidential information. He already *knows* which information is confidential and then matches to it.

Examiner refers further to column 13 which teaches identifiers but the identifiers in column 13 have nothing to do with confidential information and, as mentioned, merely make up the tables which form the knowledge base.

Examiner further refers to column 21 for further details of the process. This passage is a description of Fig. 17D. Both the passage itself and the figure are entirely *silent* on *identifying* confidential information. A hit is either accepted or rejected by the user. If accepted it goes into the public part of the profile. If rejected it is ignored. There is nothing in this passage that suggests or hints at *using statistics* to *identify* confidential information. Privacy is decided by the user.

In this connection applicant makes reference to Figure 15A of Gilmore. This is believed to be the closest that Gilmore gets to the claimed feature. The user sets a threshold at a desired level. If the term beats the threshold it goes into one part of the profile and if it does not beat the threshold it goes into another part of the profile. Thus thresholding is used to decide that information is to be kept private. However this passage is silent on *identifiers* and on any content database of confidential information. The precise teaching that is missing, even in Fig. 15A is the use of *identifiers* to *statistically* connect *content* at a *workstation* with *known* confidential information. The reason this is missing is because Gilmore does not use identifiers in this way and does not identify confidential information in this way. As he is dealing with *user privacy*, and different users may have *different privacy requirements,* a common set of identifiers would be useless.

Furthermore the claim requires that the content identified as being confidential is that at the *workstation*. Gilmour does not teach a workstation but rather teaches a user profile being set up remotely on a network based on emails and like material going back and forth. Gilmour therefore considers information being gathered from emails onto a server. There is no workstation.

Thus the combination of Ginter, Gilmour and Peinado fails to teach:

"b) *detecting whether content* in use *at said workstation* in association with said actions being monitored *comprises confidential*

information, said detecting comprising performing a statistical analysis of said content in use by said user *using identifiers from a content identifier database,* said statistical analysis *using said identifiers to associate said content with respective confidential information,* said confidential information being associated with respective predefined policies".

Specifically, there is no teaching of *using statistical methods* involving *identifiers* to determine whether content on the workstation associated with an action *is confidential information.*

The nearest that the prior art teaches is the use of identifiers in a term table that has nothing to do with confidential information, and the entirely separate use of thresholding to designate (not identify) information as confidential – but without using identifiers.

The present embodiments are to do with management of confidential information. Gilmour is to do with the field of knowledge bases and addresses issues of privacy, but not of confidentiality. Ginter is to do with electronic commerce and Peinado is to do with digital rights management.

Yet the Examiner is suggesting that it would be obvious for the skilled person to combine features from these three disparate applications in separate fields, including a combination which Gilmour *explicitly* does *not* make, that of identifiers together with confidential information.

Thus claim 1 is believed to be novel and inventive in light of the cited prior art.

The same feature of identifiers being used in a statistical process to identify information at a workstation as being confidential information, is present in each of the other independent claims, which are believed to be novel and inventive for the same reasons.

5

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et alExaminer: Thomas A. GYORFI

Serial No.: 10/748,178 Group Art Unit: 2435

Filed: December 31, 2003 Attorney Docket: **27153**

Office Action Mailing Date: May 23, 2011 Confirmation No.: 5563

In view of the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-80, 107-130 and 147 - 149 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
Registration No. 56,437
Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: August 22, 2011